



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,906	12/21/2005	Miroslav Patek	281642US0XPCT	1503
22850	7590	08/22/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			DESAI, ANAND U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/22/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/561,906	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PATEK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANAND U. DESAI, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ANAND U. DESAI, Ph.D. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Dr. Tom Cunningham. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kopecky et al. reference cited in paragraph 16 of office action mailed July 11, 2008.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: There is a typographical error in the office action mailed July 11, 2008. Paragraph 16 appears to have been text that was meant to be deleted. The claims are not rejectd under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kopecky et al. as stated in the office action. No response to the Kopecky et al. art rejection is required because the reference is not applied against claims 1, and 3-6.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/ANAND U DESAI, Ph.D./ Examiner, Art Unit 1656	
---	--